UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

JONATHAN SANTIAGO, Plaintiff, Civil Action No. 13-cv-12172-IT v. THOMAS LAFFERTY and CITY OF LOWELL, Defendants. *********** NEL SOTHY, Plaintiff, Civil Action No. 13-cv-12302-IT v. THOMAS LAFFERTY and CITY OF LOWELL, Defendants. *********** TITUS KURIA, * Plaintiff, Civil Action No. 13-cv-12303-IT v. THOMAS LAFFERTY and CITY OF LOWELL, Defendants.

<u>ORDER</u>

January 22, 2015

TALWANI, D.J.

The court hereby ALLOWS Plaintiff's <u>Assented-to Motion to Modify Protective Order</u> [#95]. With regard to paragraph seven of the protective order, the parties are reminded that

nothing in the protective order limits the court's power to make orders concerning the disclosure or impoundment of documents produced in discovery or at trial.¹ Accordingly, pursuant to Local Rule 7.2, no materials may be filed under seal unless the party seeking impoundment first files a motion to seal with the court and makes a particularized showing of the need for impoundment. Only upon the allowance of such a motion shall any party file such materials under seal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

January 22, 2015

/s/ Indira Talwani

United States District Judge

¹ <u>See United States v. Kravetz</u>, 706 F.3d 47, 59 (1st Cir. 2013) (emphasizing that "only the most compelling reasons can justify non-disclosure of judicial records' that come within the scope" of the public's "presumptive" right of access to judicial documents (quoting <u>In re Providence</u> Journal, 293 F.3d 1, 10 (1st Cir. 2002))).